REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated August 1, 2005. Claims 8-10, 39-41 and 62-71 are now present in this case. Claims 8, 9, 39, 40, and 62-66 are amended.

Claims 8-10, 39-41, and 62-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,621,727 to Robins et al. combined with U.S. Patent No. 5,852,818 to Bohm et al. The applicants note that the patent numbers cited in the Office Action of August 1, 2005 are incorrect. Based on a telephone conference with the Examiner on August 25, 2005, it appears that the Office Action contained a typographical error. The patent to Robins should be U.S. Patent No. 5,049,873 while the patent to Bohm et al. is U.S. Patent No. 5,982,780. The Examiner is kindly thanked for issuing a corrected Office Action on August 25, 2005.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. The Office Action states, with respect to claim 39, that Robins discloses all claim elements except to explicitly detail event tokens as a token pool. (See Office Action, page 4.) This is incorrect. The Office Action cites small sections of a 62 column reference. When the reference is considered in its entirety, it clearly teaches away from the system of claim 39. It appears that word searches have been performed to identify key words that match certain elements of claim 39, but without regard to the actual meaning of those key words within the reference and without regard to the fact that the key words refer to completely different operational components and structures within Robins. For example, the Office Action states, at pages 2-3, that Robins discloses a master platform having a master global routing table. This is incorrect. The cited section of Robins discusses a master central processing unit (CPU) as opposed to a co-processor. This is unrelated to any network *per se* and simply refers to the desire to execute a monitor process on a co-processor rather than a master processor of the node, if possible, to optimize memory for data that the interface can use as well as minimizing the impact of monitoring tasks on call processing tasks in the node. (See column 9, lines 7-12.) Thus, it appears that the various switches may each contain a master CPU as well as one or more co-processors. This is not

equivalent to a master platform in a messaging computer network. There is no teaching or suggestion of a master platform in a messaging network, as recited in claim 39. Bohm et al. is cited only for its use of tokens. The combination of references do not suggest the master platform recited in claim 39. For this reason, among others, claim 39 is clearly allowable over Robins and Bohm. Claims 40-41 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 39, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

The Office Action states that claims 8-10 are rejected for the same rationale as set forth in claims 39-41. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. Claim 8 is a method claim that recites responding to each of the plurality of messaging platform on the messaging network that sends a response message to the master platforms and "sending a query message to a selected one of the plurality of messaging platforms on the messaging network that fails to send a response message to the master platform within said selected interval." The sections of Robins cited in the Office Action in support of such a process are taken out of context and, when considered in its entirety, teach away from the method recited in claim 8. Specifically, the Office Action cites column 38, lines 5-15 of Robins as teaching that each messaging platform sends a response message at selected intervals. This is incorrect. Robins discloses a network in which a monitor node 11 (see Figure 1) maintains a network topology application (NTA) that periodically polls the network manager or its neighbor node to determine if the topology has changed. Thus, Robins discloses a central location sending polling queries to neighbor nodes. This teaches directly away from the method recited in claim 8 wherein the messaging platforms send messages to the master platform at selected intervals. The Office Action further cites column 34, lines 60-65 of Robins as purportedly teaching sending a query message to a messaging platform that fails to send a response message to the master platform within the selected interval. This is incorrect. The section of Robins cited in the Office Action, at page 3, relates to a totally different operation and is unrelated to any query message, response message, or, for that matter, messages between messaging platforms. The cited section of Robins refers to a message sent in response to the failure of an internal

database (DBC). (See column 4, lines 61-64.) Nothing in the cited section relates to the failure of a messaging platform to send a response message within a predetermined interval nor a master platform sending a query message to a messaging platform that does not send such a response message. Bohm does not overcome the serious deficiencies of Robins. The combination of references do not teach or suggest the method recited in claim 8. For this reason, among others, claim 8 is clearly allowable over Robins and Bohm. Claims 9-10 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 8, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

The Office Action states on page 2 that claims 62-71 are rejected over the combination of Robins and Bohm, but fails to include any details as to the nature of the rejection of claim 62. However, for the sake of advancing prosecution, it should be noted that claim 62 is an apparatus claim in which a master device is "capable of altering the operational status of the messaging device entry of the at least one messaging device to a disabled status if the at least one messaging device fails to respond to the second message type." The Office Action cites column 32, lines 25-40 and column 33, lines 1-5 as purportedly teaching such a process. This is incorrect. It should be noted that the two portions of Robins cited in the Office Action relate to different processes and neither teaches or suggests updating the operational status to a disabled status if the messaging device fails to respond to the second message type. Column 32 of Robins refers to an initialization process wherein a database does not indicate a particular node as "up" until a copy of the database has been transferred from the particular node to a monitor node. Once the database has been transferred to the monitor node, initialization is complete and the particular node is indicated as "up." (See column 32, lines 33-39.) Nothing in this section suggests changing a status of a device to disabled based on the failure to respond to any messages. The section in column 33 relates to a different process and merely states that a database contains a node up/down state. There is no suggestion that the operational status is changed to disabled (or down) if the messaging device fails to respond to a certain message type, as recited in claim 62. Bohm does not overcome the serious deficiencies of Robins. The combination of references do not suggest the apparatus of claim 62. Accordingly,

for these reasons, among others, claim 62 is allowable over Robins and Bohm. Claims 63-71 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 62, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Michael J. Donohue
Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc

2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1680663_1.DOC 67771-5